DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 126 HE 024 159

AUTHOR Dottin, Erskine S.
TITLE A Survey of Faculty Perceptions Regarding Workplace Democracy: A Descriptive Case Study of an Institution of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY University of West Florida, Pensacola.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Faculty; *Employer Employee Relationship; Higher Education; *Organizational Climate; Participative Decision Making; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS University of West Florida; *Workplace Democracy

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the attitudes, feelings, and perceptions of faculty members at the University of West Florida toward the larger workplace (the organization) and, in particular, their immediate work setting (climate). The two primary questions to be answered were: (1) do faculty perceive their departments as promoting or restricting workplace democracy? and (2) are there significant differences among departments in their promotion or restriction of workplace democracy? Faculty members (N=273) in about half of the academic departments at the University of West Florida were mailed a 72-item survey, instrument (the Humanistic Climate Scale) of which 100 were returned and found usable for the study. The results of the study showed that there is a significant difference among faculty in 14 departments regarding the perceived importance placed in their work environments on authentic self-disclosure and expression, on experiencing and exploring the work environment, on sharing with others, and on having a feeling of community and connection. The findings lead to the conclusion that departments at the University of West Florida are not all facilitating a humanistic work climate. Contains 25 references. (Author/GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Erskine S.

Dottin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A SURVEY OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS REGARDING WORKPLACE DEMOCRACY:
A DESCRIPTIVE CASE STUDY OF AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the attitudes, feelings, and perceptions of faculty members at the University of West Florida toward the larger workplace (the organization) and, in particular, their immediate work setting (climate).

Faculty members in about half of the academic departments at the University of West Florida responded to a seventy-two item instrument, the Humanistic Climate Scale, during the Spring semester of 1990.

The results of the study show that there is a significant difference among faculty in fourteen departments regarding the perceived importance placed in their work environments on their disclosing and expressing themselves authentically, their experiencing and exploring their work environment through their own being rather than having it imposed by an authority, their sharing with others, and their having a feeling of community and connection.

A SURVEY OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS REGARDING WORKPLACE DEMOCRACY: A DESCRIPTIVE CASE STUDY OF AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

INTRODUCTION

Organizational climate has always been of special interest to administrative and management scientists. Such interests have ranged the gamut from that of Frederic Taylor (1947) whose work focused on climate that would facilitate classic management perspectives of the worker as "homo economicus," to that of Maslow (1954), McGregor (1960), Herzberg (1966), and Michael Maccoby (1975) among others whose work centered on humanizing the organization.

The post-industrial technological era has precipitated an even more salient interest in organizational climates as calls for innovative changes in organizations to meet new productive realities have permeated the literature (Kanter, 1983; Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; and Toffler, 1985).

According to Maserick (1988) organizations are changing from the old technical emphasis guided by logical positivism and behaviorism as far as human resources are concerned to a greater focus on such intangible factors as: "human values, new forms of social interaction, commitment, a service-orientation, risk-taking, independent thinking, integration among units within the organization as well as in external interfaces, and creativity." (Maserick, 1988: 189)

Humanizing the "assembly line" is now seen within organizational perspectives as being correlated positively with high productivity. As a result, to motivate individuals within organizations, is now being

focused less on lower order needs, and more on esteem needs (Toch & Grant, 1982). The push for a "quality of work life" that enhances "consensus democracy" (Fromm, 1976) requires that work settings and climates must care about the worker as person, and "must provide occasions for workers to become known, to express their views, to think, and to make decisions. This solution is 'humanistic' because it converts assembly-line production into human production, to output for which people are individually responsible and in which people have a personal stake." (Toch & Grant, 1982: 126)

This humanistic focus within organizations has also precipitated a paradigmatic shift from a behavioral model to what Maserick (1988) suggests is an interpretive paradigm "derived from humanism and phenomenology, in which learning is seen as a process of interaction leading to a better understanding of the meaning of experiences." (Maserick, 1988: 190)

This paradigmatic shift necessitates exploratory research to ascertain whether organizational climate, that component of the total environmental quality within an organization, and which according to Ennis, et al. (1989) "represents the social and contextual qualities of an organization as perceived by the participants," (Ennis, et al., 1989:76) is facilitating more or less workplace democracy.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was aimed generically at learning more about what it is like to work at the University of West Florida, i.e., the quality of work life, and to measure the attitudes and opinions about the work climate at the institution from the employees', i.e., faculty's point of view.

More specifically, the study was intended to ascertain the perceptions of faculty members and academic librarians at the University of West Florida regarding their workplace climate and its humanistic qualities or lack thereof.

This study was therefore guided by the following research questions:

1. Do faculty members at the University of West Florida perceive their departments as promoting or restricting workplace democracy?
2. Are there significant differences among departments in their promotion or restriction of workplace democracy?

METHODOLOGY

This study was guided by the basic assumptions of humanistic theory that events simply are, and any attempt to define the nature of basic events is to construct a mode of description about the event (Mahrer, 1978).

The mode of inquiry here falls within the province of the phenomenological scientist whose interest is in staying with the event rather than leaving it (Mahrer, 1978). This methodology is in stark contrast to the scientific method of seeking to understand the phenomenon by rushing off to variables and factors related to it.

The exploratory nature of this study thus permits the use of a form of descriptive research -- the case study. While there are major weaknesses in the case study approach, [1] this method, on the other hand, has several advantages which are useful for this study.[2]

The population for this descriptive case study was all those persons with faculty status in the three colleges, computer division, and the library at the University of West Florida. From an official

list supplied by the Office of Human Resources twenty-eight departments were identified: seventeen (17) in the College of Arts and Sciences; four (4) in the College of Business; five (5) in the College of Education; one (1) in the Division of Computer Science; and one (1) comprised of the academic librarians in the university library. Eligible full-time members in each of these departments (273) were then mailed, at the beginning of April 1990, a cover letter soliciting their cooperation in the study, and a copy of the 72-item survey instrument, THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE. They were given about a three-week period in which to complete and return the instrument by the requested deadline.

Out of the 273 survey instruments mailed, 100 or 36.6 percent usable instruments were returned as is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS RETURNED

College/division	Faculty	Number Returned	Percentage
Arts & Sciences	136	44	32.4
Business	50	21	42.0
Education	48	21	43.8
Computer Science	21	3	14.3
Library	18	11	61.1
Total	273	100	36.63

The Humanistic Climate Scale used to collect data for the study is a 72-item survey instrument. The Likert-Scale instrument was developed by the investigator, and is designed to measure the

perceptions of individuals about the importance placed in social environments (groups, organizations, etc.,) on six key humanistic elements: Scale 1 - disclosing and expressing self authentically; Scale 2 - making choices from one's actions, i.e., having a sense of responsibility; Scale 3 - acquiring personal meaning of events; Scale 4 - self-determination; Scale 5 - sharing with others; and Scale 6 - having a sense of connection, i.e., community.

The scale which may be used with small or large groups in formal or informal organizations has a scale reliability (Alpha Cronbach Coefficiency) of .96 obtained from a test group of juniors and seniors at the University of West Florida. Reliability coefficients for the six sub-scales are: Scale 1 - .79; Scale 2 - .78; Scale 3 - .86; Scale 4 - .76; Scale 5 - .85; and Scale 6 - .91.

The scale is also assumed to have reasonable face and content validity. This is predicated on comments and suggestions received from experts who have constructed similar instruments. The views of the experts were utilized in improving the quality of the instrument.

The items on the scale elicit responses of either Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. The responses are weighted to positively worded statements such that weights of 5-points are assigned to Strongly Agree (SA), 4-points to Agree (A), 3-points to Uncertain (U), 2-points to Disagree (D), and 1-point to Strongly Disagree (SD). The weightings are reversed in negatively worded statements: 5-points (SD), 4-points (D), 3-points (U), 2-points (A), and 1-point (SA).

The analysis of the data was done by focusing on the two research questions that guided the study. Answers to question one were provided

by the use of the simple arithmetic mean. The minimum point of agreement was established to be 3.50. This was found to be appropriate because it is the upper real limit of the mid-point between the points of 5 and 1 in the response scale. Answers to question two were obtained by the use of simple one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

RESULTS

Research Question 1. Do faculty members at the University of West Florida perceive their departments as promoting or restricting workplace democracy?

TABLE 2

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Departments	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	SCALES 1	2	3	4	5	6
Social Work	5	4	80.0	4.1	4.0	4.4	3.8	4.4	4.0
Psychology	13	8	61.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.3
Philosophy	5	3	60.0	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.0
Nursing	6	3	50.0	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.2	2.8
Music	4	2	50.0	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0
Biology	12	6	50.0	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.8	1.9
Political Sci	16	7	44.0	2.7	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.4
Art	8	3	38.0	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.3	3.8
Mathematics	13	3	23.0	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.9
Comm Arts	9	2	22.0	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.0
History	6	1	17.0	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.6

Table 2 (Continued)

Faculty Perceptions in the College of Arts & Sciences

Departments	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	Scales 1	2	3	4	5	6
Sociol/Anthro	7	1	14.0	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.8
Engl/For Lan	15	1	7.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.4
Chemistry	7	0	0.0						
Health/L/S	5	0	0.0						
Physics	2	0	0.0						
Theatre	3	0	0.0						

(Agreement on each scale is 3.5 and above)

Scale 1= Being a whole person; Scale 2 = Having a sense of responsibility; Scale 3 = Acquiring personal meaning; Scale 4 = Being autonomous; Scale 5 = Cooperating with others; Scale 6 = Having a feeling of community.

The data in Table 1 show the perceptions of faculty members located in academic departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. These perceptions are expressed in the form of mean scores for each of the six sub-scales.

According to respondents in the College of Arts and Sciences at least three-fifths (3/5) of the departments facilitate their making decisions from their own actions, their acquiring personal meaning of events, and their having a sense of self-determination.

About half (1/2) of the departments facilitate their disclosing and expressing themselves authentically, and their sharing with

others.

On the other hand, only about three-tenths (3/10) of the departments facilitate faculty having a sense of connection.

TABLE 3

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS IN THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Department	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	SCALES 1	2	3	4	5	6
S.B.D.C*	6	4	67.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.9
Management	11	6	55.0	3.4	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.6	3.3
Econ/Market	13	6	46.0	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.4
Finance/Acct	20	5	25.0	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.3

* Small Business Development Center

The data in Table 3 show the perceptions of faculty members located in departments in the College of Business. According to respondents, their departments all facilitate their making decisions from their own actions, and their sharing with others. Three-quarters (3/4) of the departments facilitate their acquiring personal meaning of events. Half (1/2) of the departments facilitate their disclosing and expressing themselves authentically, and their having a sense of self-determination.

On the other hand, only a quarter (1/4) of the departments facilitate faculty having a sense of connection.

TABLE 4

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	SCALES 1	2	3	4	5	6
E.R.D.C*	8	7	88.0	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0
Elem/Sec Ed	19	11	58.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.3
Ed/Leadership	7	2	29.0	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.4
Tech/Voc Ed	9	1	11.0	3.6	3.5	3.0	4.3	4.1	3.8
Special Ed	5	0	0.0						

* Educational Research & Development Center

The data in Table 4 show the perceptions of faculty members located in the academic departments in the College of Education. According to respondents, about half (1/2) of the departments facilitate their disclosing and expressing themselves authentically, making decisions from their own actions, having a sense of self-determination, sharing with others, and having a sense of connection.

On the other hand, only a quarter (1/4) of the departments facilitate their acquiring personal meaning of events.

TABLE 5

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS IN THE DIVISION OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

Department	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	SCALES 1	2	3	4	5	6
Computer Sci	21	3	14.3	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.0	2.4

The data in Table 5 show the perceptions of faculty members located in the Division of Computer Science. According to respondents their division does not facilitate their disclosing and expressing themselves authentically, their making decisions from their own actions, their acquiring personal meaning of events, their having a sense of self-determination, their sharing with others nor their having a sense of connection.

TABLE 6

PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

Department	Number Faculty	Number Respondents	%	SCALES 1	2	3	4	5	6
Library	18	11	61.0	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.1

The data in Table 6 show the perceptions of the professional staff members in the University Library. According to respondents their work in the library facilitates their acquiring personal meaning of events

and their sharing with others.

On the other hand, their work in the Library does not facilitate their disclosing and exprssing themselves authentically, their making decisions from their own actions, their having a sense of self-determination nor their having a sense of connection.

An overall analysis of the foregoing data with regard to research question number one suggests that while some faculty members and academic librarians at the University of West Florida perceived their workplace environments as promoting a humanistic climate, others did not.

The data in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of faculty perceptions suggest that those who responded to the Humanistic Climate Scale survey in the departments of Social Work, Music, Art, Communication Arts, Sociology/Anthropology/Geography, Small Business Development Center, and Educational Research Development Center, generally perceived their departments as facilitating humanistic climates on each of the six key humanistic elements of the Scale. On the other hand, faculty in the departments of Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, and Computer Science, generally agreed that their workplaces were not facilitating humanistic climates on any of the six key humanistic elements.

SUB-SCALE 1. BEING A WHOLE PERSON

Faculty responses indicated that there were healthy social environments facilitating a great deal of importance being placed on persons disclosing and expressing themselves authentically in the departments of Social Work, Psychology, Music, Art, Communication

Arts, Sociology/Anthropology, English & Foreign Language, Small Business Development, Economics & Marketing, Educational Research Development Center, and Technical & Vocational Education.

In fact, respondents in the Art Department were in consensus that in their workplace environment you are allowed to be who and what you are, while respondents from the Small Business Development Center expressed satisfaction with their being able to experience good inner feelings from being in their work environment.

On the other hand, faculty were not getting a sense of intrinsic worth from their workplace environments in the departments of Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Mathematics, History, Management, Finance & Accounting, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, Computer Science, and the Library.

For example, faculty in the Biology Department who responded to the survey felt that in their workplace people did not trust each other. The respondents from the Mathematics Department, the History Department, the Library, and the Management Department did not perceive a great deal of importance being placed in their work climate on self-disclosure and authenticity. On the other hand, faculty from the Department of Economics & Marketing, and the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education expressed serious concern about the level of distrust among its members, while respondents from the Department of Finance & Accounting perceived individuals as keeping secrets about themselves thus precipitating persons not really knowing each other. They also did not feel that they could express how they really felt on any matter to each other, neither did they nor respondents in SBDC,and Computer Science feel they were free to disobey so they could genuinely obey when they saw the need.

SUB-SCALE 2. HAVING A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY.

According to respondents, an emphasis is placed on persons making decisions from their own actions in the departments of Social Work, Psychology, Music, Art, Communication Arts, History, Sociology/Anthropology, English and Foreign Language, SBDC, Management, Economics & Marketing, Finance & Accounting, ERDC, and Technical & Vocational Education.

Faculty from the Department of Social Work were in total agreement that the high point of their work environment was the opportunity to participate in decisions that affected their lives. They concurred that having a sense of responsibility was nurtured in their environment, and to be responsible was not simply a matter of one having status, and titles, for those without authoritative status in the department were also held responsible.

The responses of faculty in the Department of Art highlighted their perceptions that in their work environment one can do a job his/her own way. Similarly, respondents from the Small Business Development Center indicated they enjoyed a sense of responsibility.

Conversely, faculty did not perceive their work environments as facilitating their having a sense of responsibility in the departments of Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Mathematics, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, Computer Science, and the Library.

Those faculty in the Biology Department who responded to the survey agreed that in their work environment individuals were not made to feel responsible, while respondents in the Mathematics Department, the Department of Finanace & Accounting, and the Library were not positive about their environment facilitating persons making decisions

from their own actions.

SUB-SCALE 3. LEARNING FROM INSIDE-OUT.

Experiencing and exploring the work environment through one's own being rather than having it imposed by the authority is nurtured, according to respondents, in the departments of Social Work, Psychology, Music, Art, Communication Arts, History, Sociology/Anthropology, English & Foreign Language, SBDC, Management, Economics & Marketing, ERDC, and the Library.

For example, in the Art Department and the Department of Economics & Marketing faculty indicated that they were free to use their imagination vis-a-vis their learning within the organization. Similarly, faculty in Management suggested that they were not required to learn only from the person in authority.

Conversely, there was not a high degree of importance placed on the acquisition of personal meaning for faculty in Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Mathematics, Finanace & Accounting, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, Technical & Vocational Education, and Computer Science.

Faculty who responded from the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education pointed out that individuals in their work climate did not like to hear different and divergent views about a problem.

SUB-SCALE 4. BEING AUTONOMOUS.

Those departments whose climates enhance faculty autonomy were Social Work, Psychology, Music, Art, Communication Arts, History, Sociology/Anthropology, English & Foreign Language, SBDC, Economics & Marketing, ERDC, and Technical & Vocational Education.

Faculty in the Department of Art who returned the survey contended that their workplace environment allowed their being able to

avoid conformity, and to resist basing their happiness on the expectations of others.

Self-determination was therefore not only a work environment element for the Art Department, but also for faculty in the Mathematics Department, the History Department, and ERDC. In fact, the major characteristic of the humanistic work climate in ERDC, according to respondents, was the emphasis placed on their not having to be just part of the crowd, and thus not be themselves.

On the other hand, those departments where self-determination is not seen as being enhanced in the work climate were Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Mathematics, Management, Finance & Accounting, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, Computer Science, and the Library.

The consensus among respondents in the Department of Philosophy was that in their work environment individuals' freedom to choose took a back seat to standard operating procedures, rules, and regulations. Meanwhile, those faculty in the Biology Department, the Library and in the Management Department who responded to the survey agreed that in their work environment people were easily influenced by others, while there was minor concern expressed by respondents from SBDC about the emphasis in their work environment on one being part of the crowd.

Faculty in the Department of Finanace & Accounting perceived their department's work climate as facilitating conformity to group norms, while respondents from the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education maintained that the social environment in this department did not facilitate individuals being alone without being considered odd; individuals coming before rules and regulations; nor individuals breaking the norm of following established routines regardless of the

circumstances.

SUB-SCALE 5. COOPERATING WITH OTHERS.

Sharing with others is perceived as being enhanced in the departments of Social Work, Psychology, Music, Art, Mathematics, Communication Arts, Sociology/Anthropology, English & Foreign Language, SBDC, Management, Economics & Marketing, Finance & Accounting, ERDC, Technical & Vocational Education and the Library.

Respondents from the Department of Social Work were in positive agreement with seventy-five percent of the items in the survey which dealt with their social environment facilitating an emphasis placed on their sharing with each other. On the other hand, respondents from SBDC and Management suggested that they enjoyed a sense of cooperation because they could work with each other as equals, and did not have to be led.

The Departments that did not place an emphasis on faculty sharing with each other were Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, History, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, and Computer Science.

Faculty were not perceived as working together as a team in the Biology Department, while outdoing others was seen as the vehicle to recognition in the Finance & Accounting Department.

SUB-SCALE 6. HAVING A FEELING OF COMMUNITY.

Departments identified as placing an emphasis in the work environment on faculty having a sense of connection, i.e., a feeling of community were Social Work, Music, Art, Mathematics, Communication Arts, Sociology/Anthropology, SBDC, ERDC, and Technical & Vocational Education.

Conversely, those departments indentified as not facilitating their faculty having a sense of community in their work environments were Psychology, Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, History, English & Foreign Language, Management, Economics & Marketing, Finance & Accounting, Elementary & Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, Computer Science and the Library.

According to respondents, individuals in the Philosophy Department did not get the feeling that humanity is a large family. These respondents concurred with eighty-three percent of the items in the survey which highlighted little importance being placed in their social environment on their having a sense of connection, i.e., a feeling of togetherness.

On the other hand, the faculty in the Biology Department who responded to the survey indicated that persons in their department were not seen as being important, and therefore would not be missed. They felt that individuals in their department were not interested in what each other had to say, did not enjoy being with each other, and simply did not have it together at a deep interpersonal level.

Also, the faculty who responded from the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education were generally in agreement that in their departmental work environment a feeling of neighborliness was absent as individuals did not really have it together at a deep interpersonal level, and as a result, faculty in that department did not get the feeling that no matter what their colleagues would support them.

Research Question 2. <u>Are there significant differences among departments in their promotion or restriction of workplace democracy?</u>

To determine whether there was any significance between the mean responses of faculty in the departments at the University of West

Florida, the test of significance was limited only to those departments in which 36 percent or more of the faculty in the department responded to the survey. As a result, the following departments became the focus of analysis: College of Arts and Sciences [8 departments] Social Work, Psychology, Philosophy, Nursing, Music, Biology, Political Science and Art. In the College of Business [3 departments] Small Business Development Center, Management, and Economics and Marketing. In the College of Education [2 departments] Education Research Development Center, and Elementary and Secondary Education: Curriculum and Foundations. The final department was the Library.

Presented in Table 7 is the test of significance between the mean responses of faculty in the fourteen departments when all six humanistic elements were collapsed into an overall score.

TABLE 7

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN THE FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SIX SUB-SCALES OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	115334.5	8871.8	2.59*
Within Groups	67	229507.8	3425.4	
TOTAL	80	344842.3	xxxx	

* significant at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

The result of the ANOVA showed a calculated F-value of 2.59 which was found to be above the table F-value of 1.84 at the 13,67 degrees of freedom. The computed F-value of 2.59 was found to be significant both at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels of probability. As a result, it may be concluded from these data there are significant differences among departments in their promotion of workplace democracy through the workplace social environment.

The data presented in Table 8 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in the three colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Education.

TABLE 8

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN THE THREE COLLEGES AS TO THE SIX SUB-SCALES OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	2	4592	2296	
Within Groups	67	317792.5	4743	0.48
TOTAL	69	322384.9	xxxxx	

The result revealed a calculated F-value of 0.48. This value was found to be non-significant at the 0.05 because the value was below the table F-value of 3.13 at the 2,67 degrees of freedom. This finding

suggests that while departments in the study differ significantly in their promotion of workplace democracy, there is no significant difference among the colleges in their promotion of workplace democracy.

TABLE 9

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 1 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	3418.7	262.9	
Within Groups	67	7101.7	105.9	2.48*
TOTAL	80	10520.4	xxxxx	

* significant at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

The data reported in Table 9 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in the fourteen departments in the study as to Scale 1 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 2.48 was found to be above the Table F-value of 1.84 at the 13,67 degrees of freedom. As a result, this finding suggests that there is a

significant difference between the mean responses of the faculty in the fourteen departments to Scale 1 (the importance placed in their departmental environments on their being able to disclose and express themselves authentically.

TABLE 10

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 2 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	2220.4	170.8	
Within Groups	67	7089.9	105.8	1.61
TOTAL	80	9310.3	xxxxx	

The results of the data reported in Table 10 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in the fourteen departments in the study as to Scale 2 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 1.61 was below the table F-value of 1.84 at 13, 67 degrees of freedom, and was found to be non-significant at the 0.05 level. As a result, it may be concluded that there is no significant differences between the mean responses of faculty with regard to their departments enhancing their participating in decisions that affect their lives.

TABLE 11

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 3 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE.

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	2832.8	217.9	
Within Groups	67	5744.2	85.7	2.54*
TOTAL	80	8577	xxxxx	

* significant at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

The data presented in Table 11 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in the fourteen departments in the study as to Sub-Scale 3 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 2.54 was above the table F-value of 1.84 at the 13,67 degrees of freedom. These findings led to the conclusion that faculty differ significantly in their perceptions of the importance placed in their departments on their acquiring personal meaning of events.

TABLE 12

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 4 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE.

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	2921.85	224.7	
Within Groups	67	8404.98	125.4	1.79
TOTAL	80	11326.8	xxxxx	

The results of the data presented in Table 12 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in fourteen departments as to Sub-Scale 4 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 1.79 was below the table F-value of 1.84 at 13,67 degrees of freedom and was therefore non-significant at the 0.05 level. This finding leads to the conclusion that there is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty with regard to their departments promoting their self-determination.

TABLE 13

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 5 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	3573.9	274.9	
Within Groups	67	6076.9	90.7	3.03*
TOTAL	80	9650.8	xxxxx	

* significant at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

Reported in Table 13 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in fourteen departments as to sub-scale 5 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 3.03 was found to be above the table F-value of 1.84 at 13,67 degrees of freedom and therefore leads to the conclusion that faculty differ significantly in their perceptions regarding the importance placed in their departments on their sharing with others.

TABLE 14

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN MEAN RESPONSES OF FACULTY IN FOURTEEN DEPARTMENTS AS TO THE SUB-SCALE 6 OF THE HUMANISTIC CLIMATE SCALE

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

SOURCE OF VARIATION	df	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F-VALUE
Between Groups	13	5703.15	438.7	
Within Groups	67	7472.86	111.5	3.93*
TOTAL	80	13176.0	xxxxx	

* significant at both the 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

The data presented in Table 14 is the test of significance between mean responses of faculty in fourteen departments as to sub-scale 6 of the Humanistic Climate Scale. The computed F-value of 3.93 was found to be above the table F-value of 1.84 at 13,67 degrees of freedom. As a result, it may be concluded that their is a significant difference among faculty regarding their perceptions of the importance placed in their departments on their having a sense of connection.

The results of the second research question in this study show that while there was no significant difference among the Colleges, the Computer Division, and the Library, in their promotion of workplace democracy, vis-a-vis a humanistic work climate, there was a significant difference among departments.

In particular, the fourteen departments under study reveal significant differences in their promotion of humanistic climates as perceived by faculty and academic librarians. They differ signifcantly especially in the emphasis placed on persons disclosing and expressing themselves authentically; the acquisition of personal meaning; sharing with others; and having a sense of community.

While faculty in Social Work, Art, and Psychology worry less about putting on a front than on figuring out who they are, those in the departments of Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, and Political Science cannot share large areas of their real selves with colleagues. Consequently, their respective departmental environments differ significantly in faculty being able to disclose and express themselves authentically.

The environments in Social Work, Art, and Psychology are not perceived as being conducive to a"smart-dumb" hierarchy. On the other hand, faculty in Philosophy and Nursing do not perceive their personal and private feelings being considered when their education is being discussed in their work environments. The acquisition of personal meaning, that is, gaining satisfaction from personal creation, is not facilitated throughout the departments.

Faculty do not perceive a great deal of destructive competition in their environments in Social Work and Art, while on the other hand, those in Philosophy, Nursing, and Biology do.

People are not seen as working together as a team in Philosophy, Biology or Political Science; and people are not perceived as stimulating each other in thinking about problems in Philosophy, Biology, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

Sharing with others is thus diminished, and consequently not promoted in all departments.

The Social Work Department is perceived as enhancing feelings of neighborliness, a large family, and brother/sisterhood. The Art Department is seen as having a strong sense of belonging.

On the other hand, the departments of Philosophy, Nursing, Biology, Political Science, Elementary and Secondary Education are seen as not providing feelings of a large family, brother/sisterhood, or neighborliness.

There is, therefore, according to the data a significant difference among these departments in their promotion of their faculty all having a sense of community and connection.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study one may conclude that departments at the University of West Florida are not all facilitating a humanistic work climate. Those that are perceived as doing so seem to be doing so very well, while those perceived as not doing so seem to be doing so very poorly.

These heuristic findings should be of extreme value to the university community in that the organizational literature shows a definite connection between organizational climate and employee morale, productivity, and turnover (March & Simon, 1958; Argyris, 1958).

Kalis (1980) while not focusing on the university level, found at

the secondary level that teacher morale was associated with changes in their perceptions of organizational climate. It may be deduced from the findings in this study then that there may be low morale in several departments at the University of West Florida.

The findings of this study also complement the work of others like Wynne (1980) who concluded that a positive school climate was associated with the amount of socialization among faculty; Miller (1968) who found feelings of friendliness among teachers being related to student achievement; and Rutter, et al. (1979) and Phi Delta Kappa (1980) who found teacher relationships with other teachers as important organizational climate variables.

These data from this study thus provide a perfect baseline measure for organizational development and change at the University of West Florida"since there is no way to go but up" (Toch & Grant, 1982). Like the work on "Quality of Work Life," (Carlson, 1978) this study, through the use of the survey method, may be useful in (a) helping faculty at the University of West Florida learn about themselves, and (b) stimulating critical and independent thinking about workplace environmental alternatives.

While climate is not productivity, but is correlated with productivity, the findings in this study suggest possibilities for future research in the areas of measuring the correlative relationships between climate and faculty productivity; departmental climate and student achievement, climate and job satisfaction or stress, organizational climate and labor relations, community participation, staff development, and school decentralization.

It should be noted that while the findings of this study must be tempered against the disparate percentages of survey returns, they add to the growing literature concerning the limitations of instruments to measure school climate (Kasten, 1979), and the need for climate inventories that have high validity and reliability across many different types of organizations - in particular, institutions of higher learning (Turner, 1984; Krakower, 1987).

The findings of this study also suggest the need for a follow-up study of faculty perceptions of the climate of the university as a whole. Comments from some respondents indicated that their responses of perceived climate within the university might have been entirely different from their responses of perceived climate within their departments.

NOTES

1. A case study is an intensive investigation of one organization in a field setting. Some of its major weaknesses include (a) concentration on only one case makes it virtually impossible to make use of contrasting situations; (b) there is the problem of "typicality" or "generalization."

2. A case study offers several advantages: (a) it allows many different techniques to be applied in the same situation; (b) it can be carried out in the field with the sounds, sights and smells of the real situation hitting the researcher in the face; and (c) it can be very useful in exploring change and dynamic processes of an organization.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. (1958) Some problems in conceptualizing organizational climate: A case study of a bank. Administrative Science Quarterly. (2), 501-520.

Carlson, H.C. (1978) Measuring the quality of work life in General Motors. Personnel. (55), 21-26.

Ennis, C.D., Mueller, L.K., Hettrick, D.R., Chepyator-Thomson, J.R., Zhang, X.L., Rudd, W.S., Zhu, W., Ruhm, C., & Bebetsos, G. (1989, Winter) Educational climate in effective adult education: Shared decision making and communication patters. Adult Education Quarterly. 39 (2), 76-88.

Fromm, E. (1976) To have or to be? New york: Harper & Row.

Herzberg, F. (1966) Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World.

Kalis, M.C. (1980) Teaching experience: Its effect on school climate teacher morale. NASSP Bulletin. 64, (435), 84-102.

Kanter, R.M. (1983) The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kasten, K.L. (1979) School climate and planned educational change: A review and critique of the literature. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 829.

Krakower, J. (1987) The reliability and validity of organizational climates. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 475.

Mahrer, A. (1978) Experiencing: A humanistic theory of psychology and psychiatry. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.

March, J.G., & Simon, H. A. (1958) Organization. New York: Wiley.

Maserick, V.J. (1988, Summer) Learning in the workplace: The case for reflectivity. Adult Education Quarterly. 38 (4), 187-198.

Maslow, A. (1954) Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.

Mccoby, M. (1975) Changing work: The Bolivar project. Working Papers for a New Society. (3), 43-55.

McGregor, D. (1960) The human side of the enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, H.E. (1968) An investigation of organizational climate as a variable in pupil achievement among 29 elementary schools in an urban school district. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota. Dissertation Abstracts, 29, 3387A.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985) Reinventing the corporation. New York: Warner.

Peters, T.J. & Waterman, R.H. (1982) In search of excellence: Lesson from America's best-run companies. New York: Warner.

Phi Delta Kappa (1980) Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Bloomington, Indiana: Author.

Rutter, M., Mangham, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979) Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Taylor, F. (1947) Scientific management. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Toch, H. & Grant, J.D. (1982) Reforming human services: Change through participation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Toffler, A. (1985) The adaptive corporation. New York: Bantam.

Turner, C.M. (1984) Organizational climate: Fact or fantasy? ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 038.

Wynne, E.A. (1980) Looking at schools: Good, bad, and indifferent. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath.